

Serial No. **10/029,302**

Docket No. **K-0382**

Amdt. dated January 13, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2005

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has amended claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 9-17 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the present application.

In the Office Action, claim 9 has been objected to because of informalities. Claims 1 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted Prior Art (APA). Claims 2, 5, 8, 9 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,867,509 (Tanaka). Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,711,126 (Besset-Bathias). Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,449,254 (Hadjiahmad). Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,209 (Wicklund).

Claims 3, 4, 10, 13-17, 19 and 20 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations in the base claim and any intervening claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 3, 4, 10, 13-17, 19 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations in the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Objections

Claim 9 has been objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended this claim to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

35 U.S. C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that the APA discloses all of the limitations in claim 1 (except storing intermediate CRC and length values of the data subset), on page 3, paragraph 8 and page 5, paragraph 13. However, as noted in the APA, one of the disadvantages of the APA is that the ATM cell converter must store all the packets generated in order to convert them to AAL5 cells (see page 4, paragraph 12, and page 5, paragraph 13). In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to storing the intermediate CRC and length values of the data subset included in the AAL5 cell generated in a memory without storing the data subset of the generated cell. Therefore, embodiments of the present invention have the advantage of saving memory space and unnecessary delay in processing the cells (see, page 5, paragraph 15, paragraph 16, and page 11, paragraph 40).

The Examiner admits that the APA does not disclose storing intermediate CRC and length values of a data subset included in the AAL5 cell generated and a memory, but asserts that the APA discloses that the ATM cell converter must store all the AAL5 cells, which

inherently includes CRC and length values (at page 4, paragraph 12) However, the APA, as has been noted previously, must store all the AAL5 cells generated including the data subset. In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to storing intermediate CRC and length values without storing the data subset of the generated AAL5 cell.

Regarding claim 11, the Examiner again asserts that the APA discloses all the limitations in this claim (except for generating a CPS packet by adding a packet header to the payload stored in the memory if the AAL5 cell received is not the final AAL5 cell), on page 4, paragraph 12. However, as has been noted previously, the APA requires storing all the packets generated. The APA does not disclose or suggest emptying the memory and storing the next payload in the memory, as recited in the claims of the present application. According to the present invention, only a current payload is stored in the memory. Upon receiving a next AAL5 cell that includes a next payload, the memory is emptied and the next payload is stored in the memory. In contrast, the APA discloses storing all cells received.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the APA does not disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1 and 11 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 2, 5, 8, 9 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Tanaka. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and

submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 11 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicant submits that Tanaka does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding the APA. Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 2, 5, 8, 9 and 12 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Basset-Bathias. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that this claim is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicant submits that Basset-Bathias does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding the APA. Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 6 of the present application. Applicant respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Hadjiahmad. Applicant respectfully traverse this rejection and submits that this claim is dependent on independent claim 1 and , therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons

Serial No. **10/029,302**

Docket No. **K-0382**

Amdt. dated January 13, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2005

noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicant submits that Hadjahmad does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding the APA. Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 7 of the present application. Applicant respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Wicklund. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that this claim is dependent on independent claim 11 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicant submits that Wicklund does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding the APA. Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 18 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Serial No. **10/029,302**

Docket No. **K-0382**

Amdt. dated January 13, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2005

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-20 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg
Date: January 13, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610